

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Moshe EIN-GAL
Appl. No. : 10/620,553
Filed : July 17, 2003
Title : SHOCKWAVE GENERATING SYSTEM
Group Art Unit: 3737
Examiner : Amanda L. Lauritzen
Docket No. : 1307EIN-US

Honorable Commissioner for Patents

PO Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REMARKS TO PREVIOUS FINAL REJECTION AND ADVISORY ACTION

Sir:

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Official Action mailed on September 22, 2006, and the advisory action mailed on January 18, 2007. This response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claims 20-25 and 28 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassler et al in view of Gruenewald et al.

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassler et al in view of Gruenewald et al and Reichenberger.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassler et al in view of Gruenewald et al and Ein-Gal.

The above rejections are respectfully traversed and deemed improper. Claim 20 recites “a first membrane that covers an open end of said first shockwave source device in order to seal said first shockwave source device from ingress therein of the propagation medium; [and] a second membrane that covers an end face of said reflector.”

Examiner relies on the combination of Hassler et al in view of Gruenewald et al in all of the rejections. However, Hassler et al has only one membrane that covers an end face of the reflector (please see accompanying drawing) and Gruenewald et al, too, has only one membrane that covers an end face of the reflector (please see accompanying drawing). Thus, the combination of Hassler et al in view of Gruenewald et al does not teach the structure recited in claim 20 (“first membrane that covers an open end of said first shockwave source

device in order to seal said first shockwave source device from ingress therein of the propagation medium”).

In addition, Examiner rejects claim 21 because the “spatial adjacency of the sources suggests the second device sealingly passes through the membrane of the first device”. It is respectfully pointed out that perhaps the spatial adjacency of the sources suggests the second device sealingly passes through the *sealing ring*, but the second device in no way passes through the *membrane* (please see accompanying drawing).

In the Advisory Action, Examiner states that Hassler has two membranes – “The first is the external membrane pointed out by applicant (and disclosed at col. 6, lines 55-57) and the second is denoted by [1] in the same figure and disclosed at col. 5, lines 19-22 to surround reflector [33]. Furthermore, it is well known in the art to include a membrane to shield source devices and their associated reflectors from the propagation medium.”

The above statements are respectfully traversed. Claim 20 recites “a second membrane **that covers an end face** of said reflector” (emphasis added). The membrane [1] of Hassler **does not cover an end face** of reflector 33. It is respectfully noted that the Examiner’s statement that membrane [1] disclosed at col. 5, lines 19-22 surrounds reflector [33] is an error. Just the opposite is true – that passage says: “The annular reflector 33 surrounding the membrane 1”. The reflector surrounds membrane [1] not the other way around. Membrane 1 has nothing to do with covering an end face of the reflector. As stated at the beginning of the description, it is part of the shockwave transducer: “A coil 2 is disposed inside the membrane 1, the coil tube being wound in the form of a cylindrical helix on a cylindrical coil carrier 3.”

It is also insufficient to state that “it is well known in the art to include a membrane to shield source devices and their associated reflectors from the propagation medium”. That is not the claimed structure. The Examiner has failed to show prior art that teaches the claimed structure of claim 20, particularly, “a first membrane that covers an open end of said first shockwave source device in order to seal said first shockwave source device from ingress therein of the propagation medium; [and] a second membrane that covers an end face of said reflector”. This structure is not known in the art and is deemed patentable.

In the Advisory Action, Examiner further states that in Grunewald, “Fig. 3 clearly shows spatial adjacency of sources P and E and suggests that one device sealingly passes through the membrane of the second.”

The above statement is respectfully traversed. P is a piezoelectric shock wave source and E is an electromagnetic shock wave source. In Fig. 3, there is only one membrane and P

and E do not pass through it at all (please see accompanying drawing). It is respectfully noted that the Examiner's statement that "one device sealingly passes through the membrane of the second" is an error. It is clear from the drawing none of the devices passes through the membrane.

Claims 20-28 are accordingly respectfully deemed patentable. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DEKEL PATENT LTD.

BY David Klein

David Klein, Patent Agent
Reg. No. 41,118
Tel 972-8-949-5334
Fax 972-949-5323

E-mail: dekelltd@netvision.net.il